<div align="center">REMARKS/ARGUMENTS</div>

Applicants respectfully disagree with the characterization of the reference and the

characterization of the claims set forth in the current office action. An explanation of both is set

forth below. Even in light of this disagreement, applicants have amended independent claim 29

to further clarify features of the disclosure and in hopes of ensuring movement of prosecution

toward allowance.

I.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 11-22 and 24-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Publication No. 2002/0091871 published to Cahill et al. (hereinafter "Cahill"). Applicants

respectfully disagree with the rejection. Independent claim 11 includes the following

combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the cited reference:

> setting a spreadsheet formula to a first spreadsheet cell;

> in response to setting the spreadsheet formula to the first spreadsheet cell, obtaining a formula previously set to the spreadsheet cell;

> identifying a cell reference to a second spreadsheet cell in at least one member of a group comprising: the spreadsheet formula set to the first spreadsheet cell and the spreadsheet formula previously set to the first spreadsheet cell;

> in response to setting the spreadsheet formula to the first spreadsheet cell, determining whether *data associated with the first spreadsheet cell should be redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference*; and

> *redirecting data associated with the first spreadsheet cell to the second spreadsheet cell for entry into the second spreadsheet cell when data associated with the first spreadsheet cell is redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference.*

Applicants assert that the above combination of features is not taught or suggested by the

cited reference. Cahill teaches a inserting a cell reference into another cell *to bring data into the*

cell. Cahill teaches that a user inputs a object reference into a cell. The object reference

indicates an external location for the object. The spreadsheet component identifies the object

reference and returns the object to the cell. The formula in Cahill is used to bring the external

object into the cell. Claim 11 recites "in response to setting the spreadsheet formula to the first

spreadsheet cell, determining whether data associated with the first spreadsheet cell should be

redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference." Claim 11 also recites

"redirecting data associated with the first spreadsheet cell to the second spreadsheet cell for entry

into the second spreadsheet cell when data associated with the first spreadsheet cell is redirected

to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference. This language is very clear that

the first cell includes that formula and data of the first cell is redirected to the second cell. Cahill

simply does not teach these features. The Office Action argues that paragraph 0043 and 0052-

0054 teach this feature. However, this assertion is incorrect. The referenced paragraphs teach a

cell reference that is used to obtain data and return it to the cell where the reference is located.

Cahill teaches that the cell C1 includes a reference to cell B1. Cahill teaches "[t]hus, the formula

of cell C1 invokes the object in cell B1 and determines the LastPrice property for that object.

This action effectively returns the LastPrice for the property identifier in B1. In this example,

the last stock price for the MSFT stock is retried from the object market data and stored in cell

C1." Accordingly, Cahill is clearly teaching that data is being returned to the cell in response to

the reference. Cahill is not teaching that data in the cell is being redirected in response to the

reference.

     The Office Action further argues that certain features of the claim are obvious in light of

Cahill. The Office Action recites as follows:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Cahill's teaching to include the claimed 'redirecting data associated with the first spreadsheet cell to the second spreadsheet cell for entry into the second spreadsheet cell when data associated with the first spreadsheet cell is redirected to the second spread sheet cell identified by the cell reference' because it would have allowed the user to directly call functions for objects that are installed on a local or remote machine by integrating an object function within the spreadsheet formula and provided the user with a tool for integrating outside data service into a spreadsheet and may take advantage of pre-existing objects. *Office Action* at pg 5.

This reasoning, however, is not supported. The current disclosure does not pertain to calling remote functions. Also, the current disclosure does not pertain to a tool for integrating outside data services. These are not features associated with the disclosure nor are such features discussed in the specification. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not have found such a feature obvious because the features are not associated with an capturing data from an outside data service and associating it with a cell. Applicants assert that claim 11 is allowable.

Independent claim 24 includes the following combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the cited reference:

setting a spreadsheet formula to a first spreadsheet cell;

in response to setting the spreadsheet formula to the first spreadsheet cell, obtaining a formula previously set to the spreadsheet cell;

identifying a cell reference to a second spreadsheet cell in at least one member of a group comprising: the spreadsheet formula set to the first spreadsheet cell and the spreadsheet formula previously set to the first spreadsheet cell;

in response to setting the spreadsheet formula to the first spreadsheet cell, *determining whether data associated with the first spreadsheet cell should be redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference*; and

redirecting data associated with the first spreadsheet cell to the second spreadsheet cell for entry into the second spreadsheet cell when data associated with the first spreadsheet cell is redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference.

Applicants assert that the above combination of features is not taught or suggested by the cited reference. Claim 24 recites "in response to setting the spreadsheet formula to the first spreadsheet cell, determining whether data associated with the first spreadsheet cell should be redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference." Claim 24 also recites "redirecting data associated with the first spreadsheet cell to the second spreadsheet cell for entry into the second spreadsheet cell when data associated with the first spreadsheet cell is redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference." Cahill is not teaching or suggesting that data in the cell is being redirected in response to the reference. Applicants assert that claim 24 is allowable.

Independent claim 29 includes the following combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the cited reference:

a processor; and

a memory having computer-executable instructions stored thereon, wherein the computer-executable instructions include:

setting a spreadsheet formula to a first spreadsheet cell;

in response to setting the spreadsheet formula to the first spreadsheet cell, obtaining a formula previously set to the spreadsheet cell;

identifying a cell reference to a second spreadsheet cell in at least one member of a group comprising: the spreadsheet formula set to the first spreadsheet cell and the spreadsheet formula previously set to the first spreadsheet cell;

in response to setting the spreadsheet formula to the first spreadsheet cell, _determining whether data associated with the first spreadsheet cell should be redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference_; and

redirecting data associated with the first spreadsheet cell to the second spreadsheet cell for entry into the second spreadsheet cell when data associated

with the first spreadsheet cell is redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference, wherein redirecting data associated with the first spreadsheet cell to the second spreadsheet cell includes redirecting data associated with the first spreadsheet cell to the second spreadsheet cell for evaluation by a spreadsheet formula set to the second spreadsheet cell;

determining whether the spreadsheet formula previously set to the first spreadsheet cell requires evaluation in response to the spreadsheet formula set to the first spreadsheet cell when the data is evaluated by the spreadsheet formula set to the second spreadsheet cell;

evaluating the spreadsheet formula previously set to the first spreadsheet cell in response to the spreadsheet formula set to the first spreadsheet cell when the data is evaluated by the spreadsheet formula set to the second spreadsheet cell; and

passing the evaluated result of evaluating the spreadsheet formula previously set to the first spreadsheet cell for evaluation by a spreadsheet formula set to the second spreadsheet cell.

Applicants assert that the above combination of features is not taught or suggested by the cited reference. Claim 29 recites "in response to setting the spreadsheet formula to the first spreadsheet cell, determining whether data associated with the first spreadsheet cell should be redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference." Claim 29 also recites "redirecting data associated with the first spreadsheet cell to the second spreadsheet cell for entry into the second spreadsheet cell when data associated with the first spreadsheet cell is redirected to the second spreadsheet cell identified by the cell reference." Cahill is not teaching or suggesting that data in the cell is being redirected in response to the reference. Furthermore, claim 29 has been further amended as set forth above to further clarify features of the disclosure and in hopes of ensuring movement of prosecution toward allowance. Applicants assert that claim 29 is allowable.

With regard to the dependent claims, they include features that are not taught or suggested by the cited reference. Moreover, those claims ultimately depend from the independent claims above. As such, they should be found allowable for at least those same reasons.

II.   Request for reconsideration

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Ryan L. Grace
Registration No. 52,956
Direct Dial: 206.342.6258

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE